

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**

**FILED**

2008 JUN 17 AM 10:38

CLERK US DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TO: ☒ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Huff  
FROM: R. Mullin, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 6/9/2008  
CASE NO.: 08cv0725 H (WMC) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Plaintiff  
CASE TITLE: Akers v. Rokusek, et al  
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion for Order of Clarification

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/>	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/>	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>		Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>OTHER: Improper format.</b> Case terminated. Plaintiff must comply w/ Court's order dated 6/13/08 to reopen case
		Date forwarded: <u>6/10/2008</u>
		<b><u>ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE</u></b>

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.  
☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☐ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Judge Huff

Dated: 6/13/08  
cc: All Parties

By: SPR / PSLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL NO. 08-0725 H (WMC)

**REJECTED**

MONTGOMERY CELL AKERS,  
BOP # 02866-081, PLAINTIFF,

VS.

CACQUELYN E. ROKUSEK, ET AL.,  
DEFENDANTS.

MOTION FOR ORDER OF CLARIFICATION

1. ON May 05, 2008, THE PLAINTIFF FILED A  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE COURT'S ORDER  
OF APRIL 24, 2008, RECEIVED BY THE PLAINTIFF ON

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RECEIVED

IN THE MATTER OF THE PROCESSING OF  
CIVIL APPEALS INVOLVING LITIGANTS  
APPEARING IN PROPER PERSON.

ADKT No. 385

FILED

MAY 10 2006

JANETTE M. BLOOM  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *[Signature]*  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER EXTENDING PILOT PROGRAM FOR  
CIVIL PROPER PERSON APPEALS

WHEREAS, this court, on June 10, 2005, established a one-year pilot program for civil proper person appeals commencing on June 13, 2005; and

WHEREAS, the one-year pilot program period established by this court's June 10, 2005 order is scheduled to conclude on June 13, 2006;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the pilot program for proper person civil appeals shall be extended and the pilot program shall continue until further order of this court.

DATED this 10th day of May, 2006.

*[Signature]*, C.J.  
Rose

*[Signature]* J.  
Becker  
*[Signature]* J.  
Gibbons  
*[Signature]* J.  
Hardesty  
*[Signature]* J.  
Parraguirre

RECEIVED  
JUN 6 - 2006  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
BY *[Signature]* DEPUTY